



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002

APPLICA	TION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	- CONFIRMATION NO
09/28	9,600	04/12/1999	AKIRA YAMAGUCHI	Q53967	8833
	7590	12/03/2002			
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS				EXAMINER	
	2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW WASHINGTON, DC 200383202			LESPERANCE, JEAN E	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2674	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

84

			<u>_</u>				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
, ž	Advisory Action	09/289,600	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.				
	•	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jean E Lesperance	2674				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
Therefore final rejudent	EPLY FILED 18 November 2002 FAILS TO PLAGORE, further action by the applicant is required to a jection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appenation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in				
	PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
Exte have beer 37 CFR 1 (b) above	The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Insions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of the shortened of the sh	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the date of SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE THE ON Which the petition under 37 CFR 1, sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. 4	1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.							
3. 🗌 A	applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	tion(s):					
4. N	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment				
5. 🗌 1	The a) $\square$ affidavit, b) $\square$ exhibit, or c) $\square$ request fo application in condition for allowance because: $\_$	r reconsideration has been con	sidered but does NOT place the				
6.□ T	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
	for purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
7	he status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
(	Claim(s) allowed:						
(	Claim(s) objected to:						
(	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-34</u> .						
(	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		$\Omega A = \Lambda$				
8. 🔲 T							
	lote the attached Information Disclosure Stateme						
	Other:	SUPERV	RICHARD HUERPE MISCRY FATENT EXAMINED DICKORY CENTER 2001				
S. Patent an	d Trademark Office						





Continuation of 2. NOTE: In independent claims 1, 13, and 18, the limitation "wherein the series of cells of a respective picture element expressing the tones of multiple levels are spacially adjacent" is considered as new issues. Therefore the rejection is maintained.